

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,348	09/08/2003	Stephen D. Pacetti	50623.332	4082
75	10/24/2006		EXAM	INER
Paul J. Meyer, Jr.			CAMERON, ERMA C	
Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P. Suite 300 One Maritime Plaza			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1762	
San Francisco,	CA 94111		DATE MAILED: 10/24/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

• ·						
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	10/658,348	PACETTI ET AL.				
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Erma Cameron	1762				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED <u>13 October 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	RALLOWANCE.				
☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:						
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or This post of the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If the statutory period for reply expire to the statutory period for reply expire to the statutory period for reply expires to the statutory period for reply expires	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	on.			
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri inally set in the final Office	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as			
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	s of the date of e appeal. Since			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, l	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	acause			
(a) They raise new issues that would require further composition (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belom (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	TE below);				
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a (NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		ected claims.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		Karati Kladina adam				
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 						
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: <u>59-62</u> . Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>63</u> .	will not be entered, or b) will not be entered, or b) will will not be entered, or b) will not be entered and	ll be entered and an e	xplanation of			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>05</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>33-58</u> .						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under apper y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fai ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	ls to provide a).			
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		y is solott of andon				
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 		n condition for allowar	ice because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).						
13. Other: Emp Caneon						
ERMA CAMERO PRIMARY EXAMI		Erma Cameron Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1762				

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: a) Paragraph 3 of 8/16/2006 office action (rejection of claim 63 under 112/first): the examiner disagrees that an active ingredient is not a critical or essential feature of the claimed invention. Page 1 of the specification, under "Field" descibes the invention as a diffusion barrier layer for inhibiting the release rate of an active ingredient. b) Paragraph 4 of 8/16/2006 office action (rejection of claim 63 under 112/first): the examiner disagrees that the specification supports the new matter of claim 63. The applicant has not demonstrated that the new matter is supported. c) Paragraph 5 of 8/16/2006 office action (rejection of claim-63 under 112/second): The examiner holds that the relationship between the regions is a critical feature of the claimed invention. For instance, it would be quite different to have two regions side by side as opposed to be stacked over each other, d) Paragraph 7 of the 8/16/2006 office action (objection to the specification because of trademarks): the amended specification appears to have overcome this objection.

ERMA CAMERON PRIMARY EXAMINER

Enna Cameron